

**PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**  
**April 13, 2015 Meeting Minutes**

*These minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting.*

Commission Members Present: Vincent Zimnoch, Alan Gannuscio, Jim Szepanski, Mike Forschino, and Cindy Cooper (Alternate)

Commission Members Absent: Alexa Brengi, and Pat Sayers (Alternate)

Town Staff Present: Jennifer Rodriguez (Town Planner), and Dana Steele (Town Engineer)

---

**I. Call to Order**

Chairman Zimnoch called the meeting to order at 7:05 pm.

**II. Roll Call**

Commission roll call was taken.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission seats Cindy Cooper for Alexa Brengi.

**III. Approval of Minutes from the March 9, 2015 Regular Meeting**

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Zimnoch) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0; Cooper Abstaining) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the March 9, 2015 minutes as printed.

**IV. Public Hearings**

Mr. Szepanski read the rules for conducting a public hearing.

**A. Public hearing on the special use permit/site plan review for V-Ride, 5 National Drive, #7**

The Recording Secretary read the legal notice that was published in the *Journal Inquirer* on April 1, 2015 and April 8, 2015.

Mr. Szepanski pointed out to the Chairman that the public hearing sign was put to the left of the building on Friendly's property so when you pulled in you wouldn't be looking in that direction, and you would think that Friendly's was having the public hearing. In other words, you would have to look for it in order to see it.

Mark Lacafta, Regional Manager for V-Ride, 5 National Drive, addressed the commission. He explained that he did put up two signs—one by Friendly's and one in the grass field by Seven Eleven. He said it was hard to find a particular spot to place the signs that would identify where the property was. Mr. Lacafta went on to say that they are looking for parking spaces for 15 vehicles that they would have there

at any given time. V-Ride is a vanpool commuter company assisting commuters with their travel to work. They lease their vans to individuals who would then use the vans to transport themselves and a group of people to and from work on a daily basis. The customers who lease the vans keep them at their houses, so vans are kept on the property only when they are not being leased and will be stored there only on a temporary basis. Mr. Forschino asked if they would have no more than 15 at a time there. Mr. Lacafta replied that he was correct.

Ms. Rodriguez, Town Planner, discussed her report dated March 6, 2015, revised April 9, 2015.

Chairman Zimnoch asked if the 15 parking spaces are striped or marked in any way. Mr. Lacafta replied that they are not, that there are no marked parking spaces in general for the entire lot. Chairman Zimnoch asked how V-Ride will designate the 15 spots for their vans. Mr. Lacafta replied that the space they have selected is in the northern most part of the parking lot along the field and back portion by the trees and motel. All vans will be together. Chairman Zimnoch asked if he was comfortable with them being parked away from the building with no lighting. Mr. Lacafta responded that he is comfortable with that. He added that the landlord is in the process of upgrading the light fixtures on the pavement, and there are lights in the back on the Motel 6 side. Mr. Szepanski asked if he was concerned about the vans being vandalized. Mr. Lacafta was not concerned.

There was a discussion about how to designate the 15 slots for V-Ride and ensure no one else parks there. Some suggestions were to have striping for all 15 spots; to put metal signs on posts at each spot (Reserved for V-Ride, Violators will be towed at owner's expense); or to put one sign at each end of the area then rope it off with a chain.

Mr. Steele had a few questions for the applicant. Vans are delivered to their customers who are located throughout Connecticut, Western Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island. There are four employees (Mr. Lacafta, a woman, and two drivers). He also asked what the proposed area of parking is currently being used for and if anyone parks there now. Mr. Lacafta replied that no one really parks there except for the occasional person on their lunch break. Chairman Zimnoch asked how many vans they currently have in this location. Mr. Lacafta replied about 215. Chairman Zimnoch asked how many vans they currently have on the site. Mr. Lacafta replied that they have 11 now, and prior to this there were five or six.

Mr. Forschino commented that the 15 spots should be marked. Mr. Lacafta asked for clarification of what exactly the commission is looking for regarding the marking of the 15 spaces. Another discussion took place regarding the different options, the costs, and the effectiveness of each option. The general consensus of the commission was that two signs on either end with a chain in-between would be the best option. Mr. Steele suggested a general condition that the parking spots be adequately marked and designated with visible markers and leave it to the applicant and then staff could review it.

At this time Chairman Zimnoch opened up the public hearing for comments from the public in favor of this application. There were none. The floor was then opened up for comments in opposition. There were none.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission closes the public hearing on the special use permit/site plan review application for V-Ride, 5 National Drive, #7.

Mr. Gannuscio pointed out that this is a use that we have in an adjacent parcel with Rent-a-Car and other automotive uses nearby; this is a fairly non-intensive use of the property on this site; and this fits the character and general use of this area; therefore, it is an acceptable and within reason use of this site and this area.

It was **MOVED** (Szepanski) and **SECONDED** (Gannuscio) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the special use permit/site plan review for V-Ride, 5 National Drive, #7 with the condition that the 15 parking slots be marked "Reserved for V-Ride," utilizing at least two posts and signs with other means necessary to designate the area, and subject to staff approval.

**B. Special use permit/site plan review for Inspired Intuition Therapeutic Massage and Wellness, 60 Main Street, Unit 64**

The Recording Secretary read the legal notice that was published in the *Journal Inquirer* on April 1, 2015 and April 8, 2015.

Mr. Szepanski pointed out that the public hearing sign was in the window but it was not dated as to when the public hearing would be.

Holly Schneider, the applicant for Inspired Intuition, addressed the commission. She said they currently have an office at 545 Spring Street and have been there for about three years and would like to move to 60 Main Street, Unit 64. The office is a therapeutic massage office with a primary focus on medical, injury, and sports work. They also have a lifestyle maintenance component, an infant pediatric component, and a traditional massage component.

Ms. Rodriguez, Town Planner, discussed her report dated April 9, 2015.

Mr. Gannuscio asked about the hours of operation to get a better feel for the parking calculation. Mr. Szepanski was concerned that there would not be enough parking, especially in the future when the other vacancies in the plaza might be filled. A discussion followed regarding this. Mr. Gannuscio remarked that this is a less intensive use than the video store which was there previously and felt the parking would be sufficient for this particular use. Chairman Zimnoch said he drives by this plaza every day and rarely sees the parking lot even half full. Mr. Steele commented that the square footage of the space requires six parking spaces, which is in line with a typical use.

At this time Chairman Zimnoch opened up the public hearing for comments from the public in favor of this application. There were none. The floor was then opened up for comments in opposition. There were none.

Mr. Gannuscio stated that this is the type of tenant we would hope to have in this building in terms of health, rehab, and personal service use; this fits into what we would hope for in terms of increasing more professional traffic downtown and within the transit oriented district; and this is a step towards rejuvenating the commercial portion of this property.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Zimnoch) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission closes the public hearing on the special use permit/site plan review for Inspired Intuition Therapeutic Massage and Wellness, 60 Main Street, Unit 64.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Cooper) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the special use permit/site plan review for Inspired Intuition Therapeutic Massage and Wellness, 60 Main Street, Unit 64.

CHAIRMAN ZIMNOCH CALLED A SHORT BREAK FROM 8:11 TO 8:19.

### **C. Amendment to Section 1102, Distribution of Materials, and Section 1201, Fee Schedule**

The Recording Secretary read the legal notice that was published in the *Journal Inquirer* on April 1, 2015 and April 8, 2015.

Ms. Rodriguez summarized that since August 2014 this commission has been taking a look at the process by which applicants get their submittals to members and staff. There have been quite a few discussions about some of those options. The commission found that it would be most streamlined for all applicants to submit their materials to the Planning Office for staff to distribute to commission members. This was also the opinion of the Town Attorney and the way many other towns distribute materials from applicants. It was recommended to move forward to amend this regulation; specifically, Section 1102-A all the way through the special use permit section, and Section 1201, the Fee Schedule itself.

Mr. Gannuscio added that a copy of this was available in the Town Clerk's office as well as the Planning Office.

Ms. Rodriguez discussed the changes made to these two sections of the regulation. She stated that currently copies are required to be sent to each individual commission member and staff, and a list of addresses is available at the Building Department. In Section 1102-A, paragraph four, this was changed to be more specific to add the *Building, Planning and Zoning Department*. The following was also added as a new paragraph (five): *Applicants may request a preliminary staff meeting to review site plans and special use permit proposals prior to submission of an application.* The

commission felt it was important to add that line so applicants did know that this was not only available but also encouraged, and this also offered an opportunity to smooth over any wrinkles before any meeting. Two paragraphs after that (paragraph seven), in the last line, "Applications shall be signed by the applicant and the owner of the property," this was added: *or by the designated agent where written permission has been given by the property owner.* The commission felt it was important to add this last part because at times questions would come up during a public hearing which would stall the process, and if there was written permission from the owner in some form and the commission felt it was appropriate, the application could be moved forward.

The paragraph (eight, starting with *The date of receipt...*) immediately following this was added. This follows the state statute and is not anything new, but it is something the commission felt would be appropriate to spell out to help everyone be on the same page. At the bottom of the third page a section, *REQUIREMENT OF AS-BUILD PLAN*, was added (three-paragraphs).

In Section 1103-A, number three, changes were made for clarification. It reads: *The applicant shall post a sign, available from the Building, Planning and Zoning Office, giving notice of the application, in a conspicuous place on the property for which a special use permit approval is sought, no farther than 10' back of the street property line of every street frontage. Where there are more than two street frontages, no more than 2 signs shall be required. Said sign shall be posted ten (10) days before the date of the public hearing, shall remain in place until the hearing is closed, and it shall be removed not later than three (3) days after the public hearing.* At the last Planning and Zoning meeting, the commission asked the Town Planner to provide clarification on which street frontage the sign would be required. Ms. Rodriguez said she had not written down the exact verbiage at that time, so she would like the commission to indicate how it would like this written so it can be part of the record. The only other change was on the last page under Section 1103-C-2, adding a heading called *STRUCTURES REQUIRING A FOUNDATION*.

Ms. Rodriguez briefly discussed the new fee schedule which was handed out to commission members. The new fees are as follows: \$230 for Site Plan/Modification, \$300 for zone change map or text amendment, and \$250 for Special Use Permit.

Section 1103-A-3 was discussed again. A previous recommendation of the commission was to add *as directed by the Town Planner*. It was decided that *to be located as directed by the Town Planner* would be added to the end of the first sentence (after *no more than 2 signs shall be required*).

At this time Chairman Zimnoch opened up the public hearing for comments from the public in favor of this application. There were none. The floor was then opened up for comments in opposition. There were none.

It was **MOVED** (Zimnoch) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission closes the public hearing on the amendment to Section 1102, Distribution of Materials, and Section 1201, Fee Schedule.

It was **MOVED** (Zimnoch) and **SECONDED** (Gannuscio) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the text amendment to Section 1102 entitled Distribution of Materials, and Section 1201 entitled Fee Schedule of the regulations effective May 1, 2015, reference revised draft dated March 5, 2015 as referenced tonight, including the Fee Schedule dated April 13, 2015, and additional changes in Section 1103-A-3 and 1102-G.

**V. Reviews** (none)

**VI. Action on Closed Public Hearing Items** (none)

**VII. Old Business**

**A. Discussion with Commission and Staff** (none)

**B. Action Items** (none)

**VIII. New Business**

**A. Public Input** (none)

**B. Receive New Applications**

**i. Revised site plan review, Vernon Auto Sales, 12 Ella Grasso Turnpike**

The applicant was not present. Mr. Gannuscio asked if the application was complete. Ms. Rodriguez replied that it was substantially complete, but after talking with Mr. Steele, they felt an updated survey and site plan showing more of the parking area details would be appropriate. Mr. Gannuscio asked if Ms. Rodriguez has been in contact with the applicant. She said she has been. It was decided to set a site plan review for next month.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Forschino) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission schedules a site plan review for Vernon Auto Sales at 12 Ella Grasso Turnpike for May 11, 2015.

**ii. Site plan review, C&S Wholesale Grocers, 500 North Street**

Mark Davies, Civil Engineer for Design Group Facility Solutions, Garret Lewis of Design Group Facility Solutions, and Adam Kibeski of C&S Wholesale Grocers, 500 North Street, addressed the commission. Mr. Davies discussed the location of the project. They wish to reconstruct a strip barn, which is where leftover storage and packing material from the trucks is recycled or discarded.

The original building was destroyed by a fire a year and a half ago, and the footprint will stay the same. The site has an accessible ramp which will be paved, increasing the impervious area, so they will add an underground storm water retention system to mitigate the increased effects of the runoff. They will also put up any of the required lighting they may need to properly illuminate the work area.

Mr. Gannuscio commented that he had hoped to see as a potential part of the site plan application for this property some kind of discussion for the extension of King Spring Road through the property to the land behind it. This is something the town has sought for a long time but never really got any kind of response. He asked if there was any chance of getting a response from the owner. Mr. Kibeski replied that he will bring this back to the corporate office to his bosses and is absolutely willing to look into his request. He asked Mr. Gannuscio if he knew who the contact persons were. Mr. Gannuscio said it involved the Town Attorney and has been ongoing for years. Chairman Zimnoch pointed out that there is a lot of industrial land which is now landlocked, with the only access to it from residential neighborhoods, which is not permissible, so that access point is very important. Mr. Davies asked if the commission has any records of the abandonment so they can see who the property was transferred to and from, and the grantor and grantee. Mr. Gannuscio responded that there was a town meeting 25 plus years ago, and the former town attorney did considerable work on this. He added that the First Selectman may have some information. Mr. Steele added that he has some information on this also. Chairman Zimnoch and Mr. Gannuscio commented that this would be a good opportunity to open a discussion about this issue. Chairman Zimnoch asked Mr. Davies if he could find out for the next meeting whether there would be any interest going forward with this. Mr. Davies said he was hoping to have their plan approved tonight with conditions. Mr. Gannuscio pointed out that this could potentially lead to a change in the site plan that's been submitted. Mr. Davies said that subdividing or cutting a slice of right of way would essentially kill this project. Mr. Gannuscio replied that he would like to see some thought given to this issue but would not want to hold this project hostage. Mr. Davies pointed out that since the fire their operation has been limited.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the applicant has submitted two weeks prior to the meeting, so if the commission felt it had enough information to receive it and also vote it onto the agenda, it could do so. Mr. Steele pointed out to the commission that it was his understanding the applicant was going to ask that this be taken up tonight, so he did word his report with recommended conditions of approval if that is something the commission wants to entertain.

Mr. Steele discussed some points of his report dated April 13, 2015, particularly numbers 3 and 6. A discussion was held regarding whether to approve this application tonight. Chairman Zimnoch, Mr. Gannuscio, and Mr. Szepanski felt that there are many clarifications that are needed and would like to see more details in the application before the site plan is approved. Mr. Forschino said he

has no problem with putting conditions on the approval and having staff review, especially since the business is not running at 100 percent. Ms. Cooper had a concern with the water table. There was a short discussion about the water table.

Ms. Rodriguez stated that she has reviewed the plans, and while she does not have a formal report, she is comfortable with the zoning piece of it. The only issue that she had hoped to see a little more detail on was where the trucks drive in, where they leave from, and what areas there are to queue. Mr. Kibeski commented that he would like to look further into the right of way with King Spring Road and would appreciate getting any documentation that might be available. He would also like to look into any issues the police department might have. Mr. Gannuscio suggested that the commission schedule this for review on May 11, since there are issues that need to be addressed. Mr. Davies asked the commission, “Besides the comments that are in writing, what would you like to see happen or be discussed at this next meeting?” Mr. Gannuscio replied that one of the more serious issues is the queueing of the trucks on King Spring, and maybe some detailing from the Police Chief. Mr. Steele suggested a little more detail of that area on the plans to delineate where the access is and what type of space there is to work with so as they look at it if there are opportunities to do something on site to get those trucks off of King Spring Road, they will be able to visual that better if the plan shows a little more detail in that area.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Zimnoch) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 4-0; Forschino absent for vote) that the Planning and Zoning Commission schedules a site plan review for C&S Wholesale Grocers, 500 North Street for May 11, 2015.

### C. Informal Discussions

#### i. Chapman Chase Phase 1—Sidewalk Ramp

Attorney Tom Fahey addressed the commission. He commented that the first phase of Chapman Chase has now been completed and the as-built has been submitted, but as they were going through the checklist they discovered an issue. Between Units 68 and 69 there is no sidewalk ramp. This ramp was supposed to have been built, but it was not, and they think there was a decision made in the field that since there is a driveway there was no need to put the ramp which lines up across the street. The driveway is level with the sidewalk. It’s a question of about five feet. Attorney Fahey stated they are looking for a waiver of that requirement, giving Ms. Rodriguez the ability to sign off on it. Mr. Steele added that it’s a private roadway, not a town road. Commission members saw no problems with granting this waiver.

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Cooper) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission concludes that for Chapman Chase Phase 1, the sidewalk ramp between Units 68 and 69 serves no useful purpose, and therefore is allowed to continue as is without requiring any change.

## **ii. Incentive Housing Study**

Ms. Rodriguez stated that the consulting firm has been looking at areas downtown that may be suitable for an Incentive Housing Zone; specifically, from the Windsor Locks Housing Authority piece north to the corner of Chestnut and Main Street, before you get to 2 North Main. The consultant was not sure about whether to include the Montgomery Mill and Dexter Plaza, and at the public hearing, members of the public wanted to know why those were not included, since they are key pieces to redevelop in the Transit Oriented Development Study. The consultant asked if commission members could weigh in on this issue before they do their last concept drawing. Mr. Gannuscio asked if this could be the carrot for Montgomery, if they were to be included in this. Ms. Rodriguez replied that some people say yes and some say no. Mr. Forschino commented that he went to the last meeting and was concerned about the parking issue. He would also like to see another public hearing to get more opinions. Ms. Rodriguez said at this point the consulting firm has not come forward with any regulation recommendations, but they will be diving into that soon, which will be that second public participation session. She pointed out that the concept drawing is just a picture of what it could look like someday.

Ms. Rodriguez clarified that the piece on Main Street (the hill) is owned by the Windsor Locks Housing Authority. Mr. Szepanski asked if we would have to get federal permission to do something there. She replied that it would be the Housing Authority proposing something, not the town, so if the Housing Authority wanted to take advantage of a regulation the town had in place they could do so. Mr. Gannuscio commented that one of the suggestions when they were setting the zone was that the land next to the library be developed for some kind of housing, so maybe it is a good idea to push it down as far as Dexter Plaza, with that thought in mind that that land could possibly be for housing. A brief discussion took place regarding other areas/properties in town which could be part of an incentive housing zone. Ms. Rodriguez asked commission members to email her with any other thoughts or properties that they feel would be ideal to include in the Incentive Housing Zone.

## **iii. Changing 364 South Center Street zoning from residential to commercial**

Ms. Rodriguez stated that she was approached by Grant Carragher, who is a State Marshall, about locating his office at 364 South Center Street. Mr. Szepanski pointed out that Mr. Carragher just bought the property. Ms. Rodriguez noted that everything directly across the street is business, and then north of that is all residential. Mr. Gannuscio said that Ms. Rodriguez could tell Mr. Carragher that the commission is not saying no, so if he would like to submit an application, he could.

## **D. Action Items (none)**

**IX. Communications and Bills** (none)

**X. Adjournment**

It was **MOVED** (Gannuscio) and **SECONDED** (Szepanski) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 5-0) that the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourns the April 13, 2015 meeting at 9:50 pm.

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Debbie Seymour*  
*Recording Secretary*